

I. INTRODUCTION

This report provides information to the Regional Forester, Siuslaw forest managers and the public as to how well the Forest Plan is being implemented and if Plan objectives are being met. Monitoring is intended to keep the Forest Plan responsive to change and new information, and is therefore critical to adaptive management. Monitoring and evaluation may lead to changes in management practices or provide the basis for adjustments to the Plan. Practices will be changed when monitoring results indicate the practice or standards and guidelines are not working to meet desired conditions.

This report includes an assessment of how well the Forest is complying with standards and guidelines ('implementation monitoring') and, for some resources, how effective the management activities are at meeting Plan objectives ('effectiveness monitoring'). A summary of the recommended actions, based on the monitoring results, is provided in Section II of this report; the monitoring questions and results are presented in Section III. A summary list of all resource program accomplishments and expenditures for Fiscal Years 1997 through 2000 is included in Section IV, and Section V provides a list of all the Forest Plan amendments issued to date.

II. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

The following four tables summarize the recommended actions from the monitoring and evaluation questions in Section III of this report. Not all recommended actions are included here, only those that indicate a need for follow-up action. The categories of follow-up action are:

- 1) Continue to monitor and evaluate before taking action,
- 2) Change monitoring methods;
- 3) Change or establish management practices;
- 4) Amend the Forest Plan.
- 5) What we have learned

A fifth category summarizes "what we have learned" an emphasis for this year's monitoring report.

**TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED ACTIONS BY CATEGORY
FY 97 THROUGH FY 00**

Category 1: Continue to Monitor and Evaluate Before Taking Action

Monitoring Question/Concern	Cause	Recommended Action
<u>Terrestrial - Forest Vegetation:</u> Province scale effectiveness monitoring methods are incomplete.	Tools are not available to completely analyze spatial and temporal distribution of LSOG stands.	Seek assistance from the province effectiveness monitoring group to develop useful software.

Category 2: Change Monitoring Methods

Monitoring Question/Concern	Cause	Recommended Action
<u>Social - Recreation Diversity:</u> Lack of visitor use data	Visitor use information is not collected at most sites.	Develop standardized methods for collecting and interpreting recreation use data. Raise the priority for this project.

Category 3: Change or Establish Management Practices

Monitoring Question/Concern	Cause	Recommended Action
<u>Aquatic - lake habitat:</u> Lake habitat surveys not conducted in last 3 years.	Inadequate workforce to conduct lake habitat surveys	Make surveys a priority on the ODNRA or re-evaluate priorities.
<u>Aquatic - anadromous fish populations:</u> Runs of most fish stocks at risk continue to decline.	Habitat conditions are not improving Province-wide.	Cooperate with other agencies and groups to integrate watershed restoration activities into the Oregon Plan.
<u>Terrestrial - Plantation Mgmt:</u> Funds are not provided to do precommercial thinning of young plantations.	Inadequate appropriated funds for thinning young stands in LSR.	Continue to request funding for thinning overstocked plantations in LSRs.
<u>Terrestrial - RNAs:</u> Long-term control of beachgrass invasion of Sandlake RNA needs better strategy	Pulling beachgrass is not preventing new invasions	See comprehensive management strategy in monitoring question.

<u>Terrestrial - Or. Silverspot Butterfly</u> : Species recovery plans are still out of date.	Silverspot butterfly is low priority for USFWS.	Same as in 1995-96 report. (Encourage USFWS to complete the recovery plan.)
<u>Social - Recreation diversity</u> : Recreation facilities are trending toward the more developed end of the ROS and away from their planned ROS.	Facilities are being over hardened, over developed. Inappropriate materials for present ROS classes have been used.	Maintain facilities at their planned ROS — or reassess current ROS classifications.
<u>Social - Recreation diversity</u> : Primitive quality of Wilderness areas is being impacted.	Inconsistent features have been placed in Wilderness areas.	Replace inconsistent features and obliterate roads in proximity to Wildernesses, as listed in monitoring question.
Other - W&S Rivers: Some impacts to W&S river values.	In-stream fish habitat structure projects may impact values.	Ensure planned in-stream structure projects are reviewed prior to implementation. Review completed projects for effects on W&S River values.

Category 4: Adjust the Forest Plan

Monitoring Question/Concern	Cause	Recommended Action
PSQ in the Forest Plan is not realistic.	Spatial distribution and management objectives of matrix lands preclude attainment of Forest Plan estimate of PSQ.	Reduce the PSQ to a realistic level

Category 5: What We Have Learned

Monitoring Question/Concern	Cause	Recommended Action
Are the water quality parameters for water temperature within limits established by state water quality standards?	A number of physical and biological factors affect stream temperature.	Continue emphasis on understanding interactions within watersheds.
Do trends in fish habitat indicate about as much habitat by the year 2000?	Level-II stream survey is not the best method for tracking effects of Forest management.	Rely more on other methods of monitoring.
Are fish stocks at risk being maintained?	Coastal lakes systems have unusually good coho salmon populations.	Put more emphasis on restoration of these systems.
Are viable butterfly populations being maintained?	Extensive renovation of habitat is needed to just maintain silverspot butterfly populations, let alone enhance them.	Seek additional funding sources for recovery effort.

III. MONITORING RESULTS

This section presents the results and evaluations of forest management conducted during Fiscal Years 1997 through 2000. Monitoring has been organized into four groups — aquatic, terrestrial, social and other. Monitoring issues and specific evaluation questions are presented by group followed by monitoring actions, results, and recommendations for further action. These results are summarized in Section II of this report.

AQUATIC (FISH)

ISSUE: How is quality of anadromous fish habitat changing?

Question 1: Do trends in fish habitat capability, naturally occurring large woody debris (LWD), and health and survival of streamside conifers indicate about as much habitat by the year 2000?